



PATENT

I certify that on the date specified below, this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

May 5, 2006

Date

Jennifer Badley
Jennifer Badley

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Gregory Brown and Marcellino Tanumihardja
Application No. : 09/894,274
Filed : June 27, 2001
Title : WIRELESS PAYMENT PROCESSING
Confirmation No. : 5243

Examiner : Poinvil, Frantzy

Art Unit : 3628

Docket No. : 360044.401

0805-003-001-SEED

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY AND AMENDMENT

IN RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents:

This Interview Summary and Amendment are in response to the Office Action dated 13 January 2006. Please extend the period of time for response one month, to expire on 13 May 2006. Enclosed are a Petition for an Extension of Time and the requisite fee.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On 18 April 2006 Examiner Poinvil (hereinafter “Examiner”) spoke with the undersigned (who was acting on behalf of the Applicant Entity and whom will hereinafter be referred to as “Applicant”) by telephone regarding Examiner’s 13 January 2006 Office Action. Applicant’s recollection of the substance of that interview is set forth following.

Examiner and Applicant discussed Applicant’s previous 26 October 2005 Response and specifically some questions that Examiner had regarding some of Applicant’s remarks therein. *See, e.g., Examiner’s Office Action*, page 1 (13 January 2006). After the conversation, Examiner indicated that Applicant had answered the questions to the satisfaction of Examiner.

Examiner and Applicant then discussed several aspects of the primary technical material cited by Examiner, Joao et al., US 6,529,725 (hereinafter Joao ‘725), in light of Applicant’s pending claims. The aspects of Joao ‘725 included but were not limited to those specific portions identified in Examiner’s Office Action as anticipating Applicant’s pending claims. *See, e.g., Examiner’s Office Action* (13 January 2006).

Through the courtesy of Examiner, Applicant was allowed to walk Examiner through Joao ‘725 line-by-line, word-by-word. After Examiner and Applicant had spent a *significant* amount of time viewing the primary technical material¹ in light of Applicant’s pending claims, Examiner agreed that Joao ‘725 did not show the recitations of Applicant’s pending claims. To the best of Applicant’s recollection, Examiner did not point out any teaching to combine/modify Joao ‘725 to reach the recitations of Applicant’s pending claims.

At the end of the interview, resolution was not explicitly reached, but Examiner did ask Applicant to prepare the present Interview Summary so that Examiner could review it at his leisure.

¹ Applicant thanks Examiner for the amount of time spent discussing the reference.